

Application No. 10/567,892
Reply to Office Action of October 15, 2008

Docket No.: 209546-103493

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claim 1 is amended, claim 9 is canceled and claims 13-17 are added. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

As a prefatory matter, Applicant identifies that the amendments to the specification and abstract add no new matter and do not expand the scope of the disclosure as originally filed. In short, Applicant's amendment ensures that the terms used throughout the specification comport with the units described throughout prosecution.

35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-8 and 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Donatti et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0141005)("Donatti"). In light of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The action equates the substrate layer 102 disclosed in Donatti to Applicant's reinforcement layer. See the office action dated November 15, 2008, Item 3, Paragraph 3. Applicant first submits that Donatti describes that its substrate layer 102 has a density of 48 kg/m³ to 160 kg/m³. Applicant's claimed reinforcement layer (as specifically recited in claim 1) identifies a density of between about 50 and 200 g/m². In addition and to expedite prosecution, by this response Applicant amends claim 1 to further delimit the reinforcement layer by further reciting in claim 1 that approximately 20% to 80% by weight of the reinforcement layer is comprised of strands of the fiberglass material. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or other disclosure in any of the art of record (either taken alone or in permitted combination) that proposes or otherwise identifies this claimed weight proportion between strands of fiberglass and the polymer material used in the substrate layer 102 as now recited in claim 1. For at least the reasons set forth above and in view of the amendments to the claims, Applicant submits that claims 1-8 and 10-12 are allowable and earnestly petitions the Examiner to pass the claims 1-8 and 10-12 to issue.

Applicant additionally submits that the claims depending from claim 1 impart patentability on their own and urges that subsequent examination consider not only the independent claims but the dependent claims as well.

Application No. 10/567,892
Reply to Office Action of October 15, 2008

Docket No.: 209546-103493

Finally, Applicant adds claims 13-17 such that each claim discloses patentable features that are not disclosed, taught or suggested in any of the references of record, either alone or in permitted combination. For at least this reason, Applicant earnestly solicits that the examiner pass claims 13-17 to issue as well.

In closing, Applicant petitions the Examiner to contact the undersigned before maintaining a rejection so as to explore any deficiencies that may be overcome in an expedited and efficient manner.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-3145, under Order No. 209546-103493 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: 2/17/2009

Respectfully submitted,

By Thomas J. Appledorn
Tom Appledorn

Registration No.: 59,348

HONIGMAN MILLER SCHWARTZ AND
COHN LLP

38500 Woodward Avenue

Suite 100

Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304-5048

(248) 566-8522

Attorney for Applicant

OAKLAND.1570721.1